A 1980-1 cl
7/84

Highlights of Official Child Neglect and Abuse Reporting 1982

The American Humane Association
Child Protection Division
9725 East Hampden Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80231

Highlights of Official Child Neglect and Abuse Reporting 1982

Published by:
The American Humane Association
9725 East Hampden Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80231

©Copyright 1984 by The American Humane Association

CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

CHARACTERISTICS OF REPORTING TO CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES 2
- National Reporting Over Time 2
- Report Totals and Involved Child Reporting Rates by Jurisdiction 2
- Type of Report 5
- Source of Report 6

CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES CASES 7
- Summary Profile of Reported Families 7
- Stress Factors 10
- Maltreatment 11
- Fatalities 17

CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES RESPONSES TO MALTREATMENT REPORTS 18
- Substantiation Status 18
- Case Status 18
- Services Provided 21

SUMMARY 22

IMPLICATIONS 24

APPENDICES 25

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is a product of the relationship between The American Humane Association and the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect. The following individuals contributed to this project: at the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, Aeolian Jackson; at The American Humane Association, Jane Lapp, Linda Breed, Alene Bycer, Cynthia Trainor, John Fluke, Theresa Costello, Norma Williams, Nancy Lenda, Carolyn Taft, and Patricia Schene. Teeny Kelly is recognized for her contribution in the preparation of the draft and final copies of this report.

Finally, but most important, special recognition is given the state liaisons to the National Study and those protective service workers throughout the country whose efforts provided the data for the National Study.

Wayne Holder, ACSW
Director
Children's Division
The American Humane Association

Helen V. Howerton
Director
National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect
Department of Health and Human Services

This report was made possible by Grant No. 90-CA-862 from the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, Children's Bureau, Administration on Children, Youth, and Families, Office of Human Development Services, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Its contents should not be construed as official policy of the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect or any other agency of the federal government.

INTRODUCTION

This report represents an updated profile of officially reported child maltreatment in the United States as provided through the National Study on Child Neglect and Abuse Reporting. The National Study is a project conducted by American Humane and funded through the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect of the Department of Health and Human Services.

The information in this report is derived from official reports of child maltreatment documented by child protective services (CPS) agencies nationwide during 1982. It focuses on the characteristics of reporting to CPS agencies, on the characteristics of the reported cases, and on the nature of the response on the part of CPS agencies to reported cases. (Identifying information, e.g., names or addresses, is **not** collected).

Since the first national analysis of reporting statistics was issued in 1976, this information has served to keep a diverse audience informed on the status of reported child maltreatment on a nationwide basis. In addition, special analyses of the data at the state and local levels have provided a useful tool to CPS administrators in evaluating their programs and in more informed decision-making on the provision of child protective services.

As a summary of reporting at the national level, this report presents only the general data categories. The data base for the National Study contains considerable detail for each category, and the information can be made available to interested persons.*

Finally, it is most important to point out that for inclusion in any of the percentage distributions or cross tabulations presented in this report, each jurisdiction's data must meet systematically applied compatibility criteria. The criteria are applied so that the data included in each analysis will share a common definitional base. For this reason, the amount of data included in each table (the "N") varies as a function of the number of jurisdictions submitting comparable data. In addition, the particular data elements that constitute the various data categories are presented in the Appendix. The reader is encouraged to consult this listing while reading this report to facilitate understanding.**

*Inquiries about the availability of detailed data should be directed to American Humane.

For detailed information on the methods used by the National Study, the reader is referred to ***Trends in Officially Reported Child Neglect and Abuse*, American Humane, Denver, Colorado, 1984.

CHARACTERISTICS OF REPORTING TO CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES

NATIONAL REPORTING OVER TIME

In 1982, there were 929,310 reports of child abuse and neglect documented nationwide. This represents an increase of 123 percent since 1976, the first year this information was available. As can be seen in Table 1, however, the rate at which reporting increased from year to year actually declined until 1982.

TABLE 1
NATIONAL REPORTING OVER TIME

YEAR	TOTAL NUMBER OF REPORTS	ANNUAL INCREASE
1976	416,033	-
1977	516,142	24%
1978	614,291	19%
1979	711,142	16%
1980	788,844	11%
1981	850,980	8%
1982	929,310	9%

The very large increases in earlier years corresponded to a time when jurisdictions' reporting systems were undergoing rapid development and reporting legislation was being broadened. The fact that in 1982, the rate of increase went from 8 percent up to 9 percent, while not significant, may be the beginning of a new trend and certainly warrants monitoring since the child population in the U.S. has been decreasing: it may be reflecting an increase in incidence as well as reporting.*

REPORT TOTALS AND INVOLVED CHILD REPORTING RATES BY JURISDICTION

Table 2 shows 1982 report totals and numbers of involved children as provided by officials within each of the jurisdictions. The involved child reporting rates were based on 1982 child population estimates derived from census information and therefore must be recognized as such.

*The U.S. child population decreased by an estimated 5.5 percent between 1976 and 1982.

There is considerable variation in involved child reporting rates among the jurisdictions. One of the main reasons for this is that child protective services reporting systems themselves vary. We know, for instance, that rates tend to be higher in jurisdictions that report by family instead of by individual child — more involved children are accounted for by virtue of the fact that they reside together. The level of public awareness and proactive efforts on the part of a community related to identifying children at risk of maltreatment also significantly affects reporting rates. What is not possible to propose is that there is a direct correlation between **reporting** rates and **actual incidence** of maltreatment. By definition, maltreatment that is not reported is not accounted for in reporting statistics. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to surmise from these statistics that Maine, for example, has more child maltreatment than Illinois; it is possible to conclude that proportionately more children in Maine were identified through their particular reporting system.

Finally, there were an estimated 1.3 million children reported in 1982. The national child reporting rate, based on information from the 50 states and the District of Columbia, was 20.08 per 1,000 child population.

TABLE 2
NUMBER OF REPORTS AND
INVOLVED CHILD RATES, 1982

STATE	NUMBER OF REPORTS	NUMBER OF INVOLVED CHILDREN	INVOLVED CHILD RATES: INVOLVED CHILDREN PER 1,000 U.S. CHILDREN
Alabama	24,000[13]	24,000[3]	21.24
Alaska	3,179[127]	3,179[27]	22.55
Arizona	8,944	N/A	N/A
Arkansas	8,935	15,145	23.34
California	119,685	218,605	33.71
Colorado	8,191	N/A	N/A
Connecticut	8,335	12,156	15.51
Delaware	3,114	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	3,127[2]	5,484	39.74
Florida	80,743[12]	80,743[2]	33.25
Georgia	13,384[2]	30,298	18.61
Hawaii	2,997[1]	2,997	10.78
Idaho	4,805	6,200[3]	20.00
Illinois	34,394	61,443	19.58
Indiana	23,988[1]	23,988	15.53
Iowa	22,431[1]	22,431	28.14
Kansas	19,181[1]	19,181	29.65
Kentucky	30,455[12]	30,455	29.23
Louisiana	17,968	37,733[3]	28.10
Maine	4,188	8,671	28.06
Maryland	5,843[16]	5,846[6]	*

TABLE 2 — Continued

STATE	NUMBER OF REPORTS	NUMBER OF INVOLVED CHILDREN	INVOLVED CHILD RATES: INVOLVED CHILDREN PER 1,000 U.S. CHILDREN
Massachusetts	28,869[1]	28,869	20.40
Michigan	35,580	82,795[3]	32.10
Minnesota	10,009	14,393	12.63
Mississippi	3,214	N/A	N/A
Missouri	33,965	55,862	42.26
Montana	4,342[1,3]	4,342[3]	18.80
Nebraska	4,093	5,872	13.32
Nevada	4,395	8,297	36.07
New Hampshire	2,979	N/A	N/A
New Jersey	20,193[1]	20,193	10.06
New Mexico	2,878[2,8]	5,684[8]	*
New York	69,739	N/A	N/A
North Carolina	16,979[2]	27,217	16.84
North Dakota	2,088	3,738	19.37
Ohio	23,000[3]	N/A	N/A
Oklahoma	14,676[1]	14,676	16.66
Oregon	3,639[4,5]	N/A	*
Pennsylvania	15,593[1]	15,593	5.22
Rhode Island	4,492	8,086	34.56
South Carolina	10,534[2]	23,545	25.45
South Dakota	5,048[1]	5,048	25.24
Tennessee	17,692	32,550	25.83
Texas	54,228	91,521	20.21
Utah	6,358	N/A	N/A
Vermont	1,056	N/A	N/A
Virginia	40,597[1,2]	40,597	28.23
Washington	21,536	41,565	36.43
West Virginia	7,763	N/A	N/A
Wisconsin	9,067[1]	9,067	6.90
Wyoming	1,635	2,572	16.30
Guam	166[4]	N/A	N/A
Puerto Rico	4,822	11,240	N/A
Virgin Islands	125[1]	125	N/A
Mariana Islands	73	101	N/A

*Calculating a rate using the particular information provided by this state is inappropriate.
[1]Represents individual child reports as opposed to family reports.
[2]Represents reports documented during the fiscal year as opposed to the calendar year.
[3]Represents an estimate.
[4]Represents total contained in the National Study data base.
[5]Represents substantiated reports only.
[6]Represents abuse reports only.
[7]Represents new cases accepted during this peroid.
[8]Represents reports documented from October, 1982 through August, 1983.

TYPE OF REPORT*

The "type of report" serves to summarize the nature of the child maltreatment problem as it is reported to child protective services agencies. Table 3 shows that neglect, both alone and in combination with abuse, is by far the most frequently reported aspect of child maltreatment. Alone, it accounted for 44 percent of all the reports, with abuse it accounted for a total of 63 percent.

The "other" category refers to cases for which a specific report type was not indicated and includes "at risk", which accounted for about 3 percent of all reports.

TABLE 3
TYPE OF REPORT
(N=255,472)

TYPE	PERCENT OF REPORTS
Abuse	26%
Neglect	43%
Abuse/Neglect	19%
Other	12%
TOTAL	100%

*The information in this and subsequent sections of this report is based on data provided by 36 U.S. jurisdictions. A listing of these "case data participants" and the number of reports used from each is provided in Appendix B.

SOURCE OF REPORT

As Table 4 shows, the types of individuals who report suspected maltreatment to child protective services agencies are fairly evenly divided between professional sources (48 percent) and nonprofessionals (52 percent). It is interesting to note that it is the victim's own friends, neighbors and relatives who constitute the single largest group of reporters (41 percent): this represents a significant level of lay community concern, especially since, typically, nonprofessionals are not required by law to report, whereas many professional groups are.

TABLE 4
SOURCE OF REPORT
(N=252,506)

SOURCE	PERCENT OF ALL REPORTS
Professionals:	
Medical Personnel	11%
School Personnel	12%
Law Enforcement	12%
Social Services	11%
Child Care Providers	2%
Total	**48%**
Nonprofessionals:	
Friends, Neighbors, Relatives, Self*	41%
Anonymous	9%
Other Sources	2%
Total	**52%**

*"Self" includes both victims and perpetrators and accounts for about 3 percent of all reports.

CHARACTERISTICS OF CPS CASES

SUMMARY PROFILE OF REPORTED FAMILIES

Table 5 provides an overview of the major demographic characteristics of families who are reported to child protective services agencies. Note that a "caretaker" is defined as an adult who has full-time responsibility for a child and would not include, for example, babysitters or teachers. Also note that most — at least 77 percent — of the perpetrators are also the caretakers.

The race distribution of the involved children differs from that for all U.S. children* in that 69 percent of the involved children were white, compared to 82 percent of all U.S. children.** Age also differs in that the average age of involved children was 7.1 years vs. 8.7 for all U.S. children. The overrepresentation of young children can also be seen in the following:

Age	All U.S. Children	Involved Chil
0 - 5	33%	43%
6 - 11	32%	33%
12 - 17	35%	24%

*All general population information presented in this section is taken from "U.S. Children and their Families: Current Conditions and Recent Trends", reprinted July 1983 by the Foundation for Child Development, and represents estimates for the year 1982, unless otherwise noted.

**The actual percentages for the various race categories cannot be compared because the census data do not reflect a distinction between Hispanic and black and white, whereas the data received by the National Study do.

TABLE 5
SUMMARY PROFILE OF FAMILIES REPORTED FOR CHILD MALTREATMENT

PERPETRATOR DESCRIPTORS	
Age	
Average Age	31.2 years
Sex	
Males	38.6%
Females	61.4%
Race	
White	69.0%
Black	19.7%
Hispanic	9.2%
Other	2.1%
CARETAKER AND HOUSEHOLD DESCRIPTORS	
Age	
Average Age	31.4 years
Sex	
Males	36.5%
Females	63.5%
Race	
White	70.8%
Black	19.1%
Hispanic	6.1%
Other	4.0%
Employment Status	
No Caretakers Employed	41.4%
Caretaker Composition	
Male Only	4.6%
Female Only	43.4%
Male/Female	50.7%
Other*	1.3%
Number of Children in the Home**	
Average Number of Children	2.2
Public Assistance Status	
Receiving Public Assistance	43.4%
Not Receiving Public Assistance	56.5%

TABLE 5
Continued

INVOLVED CHILD DESCRIPTORS	
Relationship to Caretaker	
Natural Child	86.9%
Step/Adoptive/Foster Child	9.3%
Unspecified Parent Type	0.6%
Other Relative	2.5%
Other	0.7%
Relationship to Perpetrator	
Natural Child	85.1%
Step/Adoptive/Foster Child	8.0%
Unspecified Parent Type	0.7%
Other Relative	4.1%
Other	2.1%
Age	
Average Age	7.1
Sex	
Males	49.5%
Females	50.5%
Race	
White	64.9%
Black	21.7%
Hispanic	11.0%
Other	2.4%

*Represents Male Male and Female Female.

**Represents all children in each home, not just involved children.

Forty three percent of the reported families were headed by a single female caretaker, compared to only 19 percent of all U.S. families (with children under 18). The average of 2.2 children per reported family is somewhat higher than the average for all U.S. families, which was 1.9*. The overrepresentation of larger families among reported families can also be seen from the following:

Number of Children	All U.S. Families*	Reported Families
1	40%	40%
2	37%	28%
3	15%	17%
4	8%	15%

The proportion of all reported families who were receiving public assistance was 43 percent, compared to all U.S. families, of which only about 12 percent were receiving equivalent public assistance. There was no caretaker employed in 41 percent of the reported families.

STRESS FACTORS

A "stress factor" is a factor or condition of the family which is perceived by the caseworker to produce stress, tension and problems within the family. Table 6 demonstrates the high degree of stress under which reported families were living. The additional fact that 60 percent of these cases indicated two or more categories of stress underscore the multiplicity of their problems.

TABLE 6
STRESS FACTORS
(N=76,555)

STRESS FACTORS	PERCENT OF REPORTS
Health Problems	42%
Economic/Physical Living Condition Problems	47%
Family Interaction Problems	68%
Other Stress Factors	29%

*For this particular part of the analysis, corresponding census information was available for 1981 rather than 1982.

MALTREATMENT

Table 7 shows the distribution of involved children for whom maltreatment information was available across categories of maltreatment. Note that because a child could have experienced more than one type, the total is greater than 100 percent.

TABLE 7
TYPE OF MALTREATMENT
(N=331,544)

TYPE OF MALTREATMENT	PERCENT OF CHILDREN
Major Physical Injury	2%
Minor Physical Injury	17%
Unspecified Physical Injury	5%
Sexual Maltreatment	7%
Deprivation of Necessities	62%
Emotional Maltreatment	10%
Other Maltreatment	9%

Type of Maltreatment and Perpetrator Relationship

Table 8 shows how the various types of maltreatment are associated with various perpetrator relationship types. For this analysis, only perpetrators who were also the child's caretaker were included.

It is noteworthy that natural parents were much less likely to be involved in sexual maltreatment relative to the other maltreatment types, the difference being accounted for by "other" parents, i.e., step, adoptive or foster parents.

Similarly, natural parents were less likely to be involved in cases indicating minor or unspecified physical injury compared to the frequency of their involvement in the other types of maltreatment, the difference is accounted for by other parent types.

TABLE 8
TYPE OF MALTREATMENT AND CHILD RELATIONSHIP TO PERPETRATOR — CARETAKERS
(N=77,214)

CHILD-PERPETRATOR RELATIONSHIP	MAJOR OR MAJOR W/MINOR PHYSICAL INJURY (N=1,541)	MINOR OR UNSPECIFIED PHYSICAL INJURY (N=12,090)	SEXUAL MALTREATMENT (N=3,173)	DEPRIVATION OF NECESSITIES (N=42,966)	EMOTIONAL MALTREATMENT (N=5,648)	OTHER MALTREATMENT (N=689)	MULTIPLE MALTREATMENT* (N=11,107)	PERCENT OF ALL RELATIONSHIPS
Natural Parent	81%	74%	57%	90%	80%	90%	82%	84%
Other Parent**	9%	15%	32%	1%	6%	2%	5%	6%
Natural and Other Parent	5%	6%	5%	5%	10%	6%	8%	6%
Other Relative	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Nonrelative	2%	2%	3%	<1%	<1%	0%	<1%	1%
Other Perpetrator Combinations	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	2%	1%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*Refers to children for whom more than one type of maltreatment was indicated and "Major or Major with Minor Physical Injury" or "Minor or Unspecified Physical Injury" does not apply.

**"Other parent" refers to adoptive, step and foster parents.

Type of Maltreatment and Reporting Sources

Table 9 shows the associations between the various types of maltreatment and reporting sources. The predominance of non-professional sources for most types of maltreatment is consistent with their representation among all reporting sources for all reports. A noteable exception is major or major with minor physical injury, which came primarily from medical personnel. It is also interesting to note that school personnel were identifying more minor or unspecified physical injury relative to their representation for the other types of maltreatment.

TABLE 9
TYPE OF MALTREATMENT AND SOURCE OF REPORT
(N=193,048)

TYPE OF MALTREATMENT	MAJOR OR MAJOR W/MINOR PHYSICAL INJURY (N=3,624)	MINOR OR UNSPECIFIED PHYSICAL INJURY (N=33,263)	SEXUAL MALTREATMENT (N=12,177)	DEPRIVATION OF NECESSITIES (N=107,003)	EMOTIONAL MALTREATMENT (N=13,136)	OTHER MALTREATMENT (N=4,302)	MULTIPLE MALTREATMENT (N=19,543)	PERCENT OF ALL SOURCES
Medical	45%	10%	14%	7%	6%	7%	11%	9%
School	11%	24%	10%	10%	11%	5%	12%	13%
Social Services	8%	9%	15%	10%	12%	13%	10%	10%
Law Enforcement	7%	10%	16%	16%	13%	23%	14%	14%
Child Care	4%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%
Nonprofessional	19%	36%	39%	42%	47%	39%	44%	41%
Other Sources	6%	8%	5%	13%	9%	11%	7%	11%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Type of Maltreatment and Perpetrator Age

Table 10 shows the associations between maltreatment types and perpetrator age groups.

One of the more significant findings of this analysis concerns the involvement of young perpetrators in major physical injury — 69 percent of major or major with minor physical injury was accounted for by perpetrators under 30 years old, whereas only 49 percent of all perpetrators were under 30. This is quite different from their level of involvement in the other maltreatment types.

For sexual maltreatment, 23 percent of the perpetrators were between the ages of 20 and 30, whereas 41 percent of all perpetrators were in that range. At the same time, 29 percent of the sex abuse prepetrators were 40 or older, compared to 17 percent for all perpetrators.

TABLE 10
TYPE OF MALTREATMENT AND AGE OF PERPETRATOR
(N=167,063)

AGE	MAJOR OR MAJOR WITH MINOR PHYSICAL INJURY (N=3,262)	MINOR OR UNSPECIFIED PHYSICAL INJURY (N=24,732)	SEXUAL MALTREATMENT (N=8,764)	DEPRIVATION OF NECESSITIES (N=66,947)	EMOTIONAL MALTREATMENT (N=9,730)	OTHER (N=7,324)	MULTIPLE MALTREATMENT (N=41,364)	PERCENT OF ALL PERPETRATORS
Under 15	1%	<1%	4%	<1%	<1%	<1%	1%	1%
15 -19	13%	5%	8%	8%	4%	8%	6%	7%
20 - 24	32%	19%	9%	22%	15%	22%	18%	19%
25 -29	23%	22%	14%	23%	20%	22%	21%	22%
30 -34	14%	22%	19%	19%	21%	18%	20%	20%
35 - 39	8%	15%	17%	12%	17%	13%	15%	14%
40 - 44	4%	9%	11%	7%	10%	8%	9%	8%
45 - 49	2%	4%	6%	3%	5%	4%	4%	4%
50 - 54	1%	2%	5%	2%	3%	2%	3%	2%
55+	2%	2%	7%	4%	5%	3%	3%	3%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Type of Maltreatment and Age of Involved Child

Table 11 shows the distribution of maltreatment types across ages of involved children, the age distribution of all involved children, and, for comparison, the age distribution of all children in the U.S. under 18 years.

One important finding that is immediately apparent is the concentration of major physical injury among very young children — 60 percent of major or major with minor physical injury was accounted for by children under the age of four. The fact that 13 percent of "other" maltreatment is associated with children less than one year is probably attributable to abandonment, which is captured by the "other" category. Beyond this, there is no equivalent concentration of any other maltreatment type among a particular age group.

TABLE 11
TYPE OF MALTREATMENT AND AGE OF INVOLVED CHILD
(N=228,794)

AGE	MAJOR OR MAJOR W/MINOR PHYSICAL INJURY (N=5,738)	MINOR OR UNSPECIFIED PHYSICAL INJURY (N=55,607)	SEXUAL MALTREATMENT (N=18,861)	DEPRIVATION OF NECESSITIES (N=175,806)	EMOTIONAL MALTREATMENT (N=19,669)	OTHER MALTREATMENT (N=14,914)	MULTIPLE MALTREATMENT (N=36,668)	PERCENT OF ALL INVOLVED CHILDREN (N=327,363)	PERCENT OF ALL U.S. CHILDREN (N=67,733,000)
Less than 1 year	20%	4%	<1%	9%	4%	13%	6%	7%	6%
1	17%	7%	1%	9%	5%	8%	7%	8%	6%
2	14%	8%	3%	9%	6%	8%	8%	8%	6%
3	9%	7%	5%	8%	6%	7%	7%	7%	5%
4	6%	6%	6%	7%	6%	6%	6%	6%	5%
5	5%	6%	6%	6%	6%	5%	6%	6%	5%
6	4%	6%	5%	6%	6%	5%	6%	6%	5%
7	4%	6%	5%	6%	6%	5%	6%	6%	5%
8	3%	5%	6%	6%	5%	4%	5%	5%	5%
9	2%	5%	5%	5%	5%	4%	5%	5%	5%
10	2%	5%	6%	5%	6%	4%	5%	5%	5%
11	2%	5%	6%	5%	6%	4%	5%	5%	6%
12	2%	5%	7%	4%	6%	5%	5%	5%	6%
13	2%	6%	8%	4%	6%	5%	5%	5%	6%
14	2%	6%	9%	4%	6%	5%	5%	5%	6%
15	2%	5%	8%	3%	6%	5%	5%	4%	6%
16	2%	5%	7%	2%	5%	4%	4%	3%	6%
17	1%	3%	4%	1%	3%	2%	2%	2%	6%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FATALITIES

Data related to fatalities was available from 24 of the jurisdictions. The actual number of children who died in 1982 as a result of maltreatment is not available through this study. However, presenting some of the characteristics of these cases involving 484 fatalities is informative.

Children who were reported as fatalities were much younger compared to all involved children — their average age was 2.04, **vs.** 7.14 years. Males and females were fairly equally represented (51 percent and 49 percent), which is consistent with all reported children. The most frequently associated type of maltreatment was deprivation of necessities, which was indicated for 51 percent of the fatalities, followed by major physical injury (40 percent) and minor physical injury (24 percent).

The single largest group of reporting sources was medical personnel (41 percent), followed by law enforcement (36 percent). This contrasts with reporting sources for all reports, for which nonprofessionals constituted the largest group.

In sixty percent of the reported fatality cases, both a male and female caretaker were present; in 37 percent, there was a single female only. This differs from all reported families: a male and female caretaker were present in 51 percent; a single female caretaker was present in 43 percent.

CHARACTERISTICS OF CPS RESPONSES TO MALTREATMENT REPORTS

SUBSTANTIATION STATUS

Whether or not a report is substantiated represents one of the first decisions CPS makes about a case (synonymous terms include "founded" and "valid"). In recent years, some states adopted a typology that accommodates varying levels of evidence and began to use categories such as "at risk". Therefore, it is no longer possible to distinguish all reports as purely substantiated or unsubstantiated. Table 12 shows the distribution of reports across the National Study's categories related to substantiation, which incorporates reports labeled as "at risk" with those labeled as substantiated.

TABLE 12
SUBSTANTIATION STATUS
(N=205,878)

SUBSTANTIATION STATUS	PERCENT OF REPORTS
Substantiated or At Risk	41%
Unsubstantiated	59%
TOTAL	100%

CASE STATUS

The second decision made by CPS typically is whether or not to open the case for services after the investigation has taken place. It is important to point out that case status is different from substantiation status; all substantiated cases are not necessarily opened for services, nor are all unsubstantiated cases necessarily closed after the investigation. Table 13 shows the distribution of reports across categories of case status. The "other" category primarily includes those families who could not be located (about 2 percent of the total) and those who were referred out for services other than CPS (about 3 percent of the total).

TABLE 13
CASE STATUS
(N=142,254)

CASE STATUS	PERCENT OF REPORTS
Currently Under Investigation	4%
Case Closed After Investigation	49%
Opened for Protective Services	41%
Other Status	6%
TOTAL	100%

Case Status and Source of Report

Table 14 shows that with the exceptions of law enforcement personnel, "other" sources, and nonprofessionals, cases reported by the various groups of reporters were fairly evenly divided between "closed after the investigation" and "protective services provided". Reports made by law enforcement were most likely to result in protective services (56 percent); those made by "other" sources which includes anonymous reporters, were least likely to do so (25 percent). Nonprofessionals were the largest single group of reporting sources; however, their reports were less likely to result in protective services relative to all the professional groups.

TABLE 14
CASE STATUS AND SOURCE OF REPORT
(N=111,359)

STATUS	MEDICAL PERSONNEL (N=11,264)	SCHOOL PERSONNEL (N=13,466)	SOCIAL SERVICES (N=12,549)	LAW ENFORCEMENT (N=12,675)	CHILD CARE (N=2,784)	NON-PROFESSIONALS (N=48,313)	OTHER (N=10,308)	PERCENT OF ALL REPORTS
Currently Under Investigation	2%	4%	3%	3%	5%	3%	2%	3%
Case Closed After Investigation	44%	43%	47%	36%	47%	56%	70%	51%
Protective Services	49%	48%	45%	56%	45%	36%	25%	41%
Other	5%	5%	5%	5%	3%	5%	3%	5%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Case Status and Type of Maltreatment

As demonstrated in Table 15, not all cases where a maltreatment type was indicated were opened for protective services. In addition, there is some variation with regard to the particular type of maltreatment that was indicated and the likelihood of receiving services. For example, cases involving minor or unspecified physical injury were least likely to have been opened for services; those involving "other", which includes abandonment, were most likely to do so.

TABLE 15
TYPE OF MALTREATMENT AND CASE STATUS
(N=62,888)

TYPE OF MALTREATMENT	CURRENTLY UNDER INVESTIGATION	CLOSED AFTER INVESTIGATION	OPEN FOR PROTECTIVE SERVICES	OTHER STATUS	TOTAL
Major or Major with Minor Physical Injury (N=1,245)	3%	24%	67%	6%	100%
Minor or Unspecified Physical Injury N=10,208)	4%	33%	54%	9%	100%
Sexual Maltreatment (N=3,446)	5%	20%	67%	8%	100%
Deprivation of Necessities (N=33,476)	3%	34%	54%	9%	100%
Emotional Maltreatment (N=4,119)	3%	20%	67%	10%	100%
Other Maltreatment (N=662)	4%	9%	86%	1%	100%
Multiple Maltreatment (N=9,732)	2%	23%	66%	9%	100%
TOTAL	3%	30%	58%	9%	100%

SERVICES PROVIDED

The distribution of reports across categories of services is shown in Table 16. Note that "casework counseling" refers to continued involvement on the part of a CPS worker with the family and encompasses a variety of activities. Immediate or short term crisis services includes emergency medical care and emergency shelter care. Long term services includes, as examples, foster care, homemaker and day care services.

TABLE 16
SERVICES PROVIDED
(N=28,018)

SERVICES	PERCENT OF REPORTS
Investigation Only/Services Planned	4%
Casework Counseling	79%
Court Action Initiated	19%
Immediate or Short Term Services	17%
Long Term or Support Services	47%
Other Services	4%

Other data showed that 54 percent of the cases received two or more categories of services. The most frequent combination was casework counseling with long-term services. Also, for the readers information, foster care or other out of home placement was indicated for approximately 12 percent of the cases for which the information was available for this study; day care, for 5 percent; and homemaker services, for 3 percent.

SUMMARY

CHARACTERISTICS OF REPORTING TO CPS

The number of child abuse and neglect reports processed by child protective service agencies nationwide in 1982 was 929,310. This represents an increase of 123 percent since 1976. However, the rate at which reporting increased from year to year steadily declined up until 1982, when it went up from 8 percent to 9 percent. This may be a new trend in as much as the child population in the U.S. has decreased.

The 1982 National Study data base contained 457,747 reports provided by 36 U.S. jurisdictions. This represented half of all reports documented nationwide. Also, the 36 fully participating jurisdictions accounted for 67 percent of the total U.S. child population.

The national reporting rate was 20.08 children reported for every 1,000 children in the U.S.

The most frequently reported aspect of the child maltreatment problem was neglect, which both alone and in combination with abuse accounted for 63 percent of all reports.

Reporting sources were fairly evenly divided between professional and nonprofessional groups, with friends, neighbors and relatives being the largest single group.

CHARACTERISTICS OF CPS CASES

Forty-three percent of the reported families were headed by a single female caretaker, compared to only 19 percent of all U.S. families. The reported families tended to be somewhat larger than all U.S. families — an average of 2.2 children **vs.** 1.9.

Forty-three percent were receiving public assistance, compared to about 12 percent of all U.S. families. Also, in 41 percent of the reported families, no caretaker was employed.

The involved children as a group tended to be younger than all U.S. children. Their average ages were 7.1 and 8.7 years, respectively. White involved children were underrepresented — 69 percent of those reported **vs.** 82 percent of all U.S. children. Females and males were equally represented among all involved children.

Most (85 percent) of the perpetrators were the child's natural parents. Step/adoptive/foster parents accounted for another 8 percent.

Deprivation of necessities was the most frequently indicated type of maltreatment (62 percent), followed by minor physical injury (17 percent). Major physical injury was the least frequently indicated type (2 percent). Sexual maltreatment was indicated for 7 percent.

CHARACTERISTICS OF CPS RESPONSES TO MALTREATMENT REPORTS

Forty-one percent of all reports were substantiated or at risk; 59 percent were unsubstantiated.

Forty-one percent of the reported cases were open for protective services; 49 percent were closed after the investigation.

The predominant service type was casework counseling (79 percent), followed by long term services (47 percent). Court action was indicated for 19 percent, and short term crisis services indicated for 17 percent.

IMPLICATIONS

In 1982, CPS agencies nationwide received more than twice as many reports than just six years earlier. Despite substantial positive developments during this period, it is clear that the current CPS system is ill-equipped to deal adequately with this volume of reporting. Nearly half of the reported cases were closed after the investigation, and many of these closed cases involved children for whom a type of maltreatment had been indicated. Furthermore, the lack of consistency of response on the part of CPS agencies leads one to question how screening and service delivery decisions are being made now in the face of budget and staff cutbacks.

Given the reality of significantly increased reporting, it is perhaps unrealistic to expect the CPS system to effectively deal with maltreatment only after it has occurred: rather, concerted efforts to prevent if from occuring in the first place are also needed. Clearly, the prevention of maltreatment must be given priority status in emerging policy directed toward children and families. Moreover, the national reporting data can help direct prevention efforts by delineating risk factors for child maltreatment.

Although the reporting data cannot of course reflect what is not reported, there is a remarkable consistency to the characteristics of reported families over time, even as the reporting "net" has widened and the number of cases more than doubled.

More specifically, the characteristics of families who come in contact with CPS agencies seem to be different from those of the general population. The children tend to be younger; they are more likely to be non-white; they tend more often to be headed by a single female; they receive public assistance much more frequently; and they have more children. Also, while comparison with the general population is not possible, it is significant that reported families are plagued by a number of stresses, including a high rate of unemployment. Finally, they tend to be involved in deprivation of necessities or neglect more frequently than any other type of maltreatment, which likely is related to their economic status.

In sum, while obviously child maltreatment is not restricted to any particular sub-group of the population, enough is now known about the majority of those families who become involved with CPS agencies so that prevention efforts directed toward the identified population can be developed. As we come to learn more about maltreating families who do not become involved with CPS, prevention policy can be broadened so that the protection of children does not depend on being identified after the fact.

APPENDICES

A. DATA ITEMS AND RESPONSE CATEGORIES FOR THE NATIONAL STUDY DATA BASE

B. CASE DATA PARTICIPANTS

APPENDIX A

DATA ITEMS AND RESPONSE CATEGORIES FOR THE NATIONAL STUDY DATA BASE

Case and Family Descriptors

A. DATE OF INITIAL REPORT

1. Date

B. DATE CASE STATUS DETERMINED

1. Date

C. LOCATION

1. State or statecode
2. County or countycode
3. District code

D. NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN HOME

1. Number

E. SOURCE OF INITIAL REPORT

1. Medical personnel
   a. Private physician
   b. Clinic or hospital physician
   c. Other medical personnel
   d. Unspecified/mixed school personnel
2. School personnel
   a. School nurse
   b. Teacher
   c. Principal
   d. Other school personnel
   e. Unspecified/mixed medical personnel
3. Social service personnel
   a. Social worker
   b. Mental health personnel
   c. Institutional staff
   d. Other social service personnel
   e. Unspecified/mixed social service personnel
4. Law enforcement personnel
   a. Police
   b. Courts, attorneys
   c. Parole, probation officer
   d. Emergency service personnel
   e. Other law enforcement personnel
   f. Unspecified/mixed law enforcement personnel

5. Nonprofessionals
   a. Friend, neighbor
   b. Victim
   c. Responsible caretaker
   d. Perpetrator/self report
   e. Other family member/relative
   f. Other nonprofessional
   g. Unspecified/mixed nonprofessionals
6. Child care providers
   a. Day care center
   b. Preschool/nursery school
   c. Day care home
   d. Babysitter
   e. Other child care providers
   f. Unspecified/mixed child care providers
7. Other source of report
   a. Anonymous
   b. Other
   c. Unspecified/mixed source of report
8. Unknown

F. CASE STATUS

1. Currently under investigation
2. Case closed after investigation
3. Protective services provided
4. Other case status
   a. Case referred for services other than protective
   b. Cannot locate family
   c. Other
   d. Unspecified/mixed case status
5. Unknown

G. SERVICES PROVIDED OR ARRANGED
(maximum of four responses are allowed per report)

1. Investigation only — services expected/planned
2. Casework counseling
3. Court action initiated
4. Immediate or short-term crisis services
   a. Emergency shelter
   b. Immediate medical services
   c. Unspecified/mixed short-term crisis services
5. Long-term or support services
   a. Foster care or out-of-home placement
   b. Ongoing health services
   c. Day care
   e. Budgeting/home management services

f. Mental health services/counseling
g. Employment services
h. Housing assistance
i. Parents Anonymous or community self-help groups
j. Legal services
k. Parenting education
l. Church/neighborhood assistance
m. Financial/public assistance
n. Unspecified/mixed long-term support services

6. Other services
   a. Other
   b. Unspecified/mixed services provided or arranged
7. Family refused services
8. None
9. Unknown

H. TYPE OF REPORT

1. Abuse
   a. Abuse unsubstantiated
   b. Abuse substantiated
   c. Abuse-substantiation unspecified
2. Neglect
   a. Neglect unsubtantiated
   b. Neglect substantiated
   c. Neglect-substantiation unspecified
3. Abuse and neglect
   a. Abuse/neglect unsubstantiated
   b. Abuse/neglect substantiated
   c. Abuse/neglect-substantiation unspecified
4. Report type unspecifed
   a. Unsubstantiated, report type unspecified
   b. Substantiated, report type unspecified
   c. Nonspecified substantiation and report type
5. Other report type
   a. At risk
   b. Other
6. Unknown

I. FAMILY PUBLIC ASSISTANCE STATUS

(a maximum of three responses are allowed)

1. Receiving public assistance
   a. Receiving AFDC
   b. Receiving SSI
   c. Receiving food stamps
   d. Receiving Medicaid, Medicare
   e. Receiving WIN
   f. Receiving other public assistance
   g. Receiving unspecified/mixed public assistance

2. Not receiving public assistance
3. Unknown

J. FAMILY STRESS FACTORS
(a maximum of six responses are allowed for each case)

1. Health problems
   a. Alcohol/drug dependency
   b. Medical/physical disability of caretaker
   c. Medical/physical disability of child
   d. Mental retardation of caretaker
   e. Mental retardation of child
   f. Mental/emotional health problem of caretaker
   g. Mental/emotional health problem of child
   h. Other health problems
   i. Unspecified/mixed health problems
2. Economic or physical living conditions
   a. Inadequate housing
   b. Social isolation
   c. Job-related problems
   d. Insufficient income
   e. Transient or unstable living situation
   f. Mismanagement of income
   g. Other economic or physical living condition problems
   h. Unspecified/mixed economic or physical living conditions
4. Other stress factors
   a. Other
   b. Unspecified/mixed stress factors
5. None
6. Unknown

Responsible Caretaker and Perpetrator Descriptors

A. RESPONSIBLE CARETAKER AGE

1. Age in years

B. RESPONSIBLE CARETAKER SEX

1. Male
2. Female
3. Unknown

C. RESPONSIBLE CARETAKER RACE

1. White
2. Black
3. Hispanic
4. Other race
   a. Asian
   b. Native American
   c. Alaskan Native

d. Other
e. Unspecified/mixed other race

5. Unknown

D. RESPONSIBLE CARETAKER EMPLOYMENT STATUS

1. Employed full-time
2. Unemployed
3. Other employment status
   a. Employed less than full-time
   b. Temporary employment
   c. Student, not in labor force
   d. Homemaker, not in labor force
   e. Disabled, not in labor force
   f. Unspecified/mixed other employment status
4. Unknown

E. PERPETRATOR AGE

1. Age in years

F. PERPETRATOR SEX

1. Male
2. Female
3. Unknown

G. PERPETRATOR RACE

1. White
2. Black
3. Hispanic
4. Other race
   a. Asian
   b. Native American
   c. Other
   d. Unspecified/mixed other race
5. Unknown

Child Data

A. CHILD AGE

1. Age in years

B. CHILD SEX

1. Male
2. Female
3. Unknown

C. CHILD RACE

1. White
2. Black
3. Hispanic
4. Other race
   a. Asian
   b. Native American

c. Alaskan Native
d. Other
e. Unspecified/mixed other race

5. Unknown

D. CHILD RELATIONSHIP TO RESPONSIBLE CARETAKER

1. Parental
   a. Natural
   b. Step
   c. Adoptive
   d. Foster
   e. Unspecified/mixed parental relationship
2. Other relative
   a. Sibling
   b. Grandchild
   c. Other relative
   d. Unspecified/mixed other relative
3. Other relationship
   a. Boyfriend/girlfriend of parent
   b. State institution
   c. Private institution
   d. Other
   e. Unspecified/mixed other caretaker relationship
4. Unknown

E. CHILD RELATIONSHIP TO PERPETRATOR

1. Parental
   a. Natural
   b. Step
   c. Adoptive
   d. Foster
   e. Unspecified/mixed parental relationship
2. Other relative
   a. Sibling
   b. Grandchild
   c. Other relative
   d. Unspecified/mixed other relative
3. Other relationship
   a. Boyfriend/girlfriend of parent
   b. State institutional staff
   c. Private institutional staff
   d. Babysitter
   e. Teacher
   f. Neighbor/friend of parent
   g. No relationship
   h. Other
   i. Unspecified/mixed other perpetrator relationship
4. Unknown

F. TYPE OF MALTREATMENT

(maximum of five responses are allowed for each child)

1. Major physical injury
   a. Brain damage/skull fracture
   b. Subdural hemorrhage or hematoma
   c. Bone fracture
   d. Dislocation/sprains
   e. Internal injuries
   f. Poisoning
   g. Burns/scalds
   h. Severe cuts/lacerations/bruises
   i. Other major physical injury
   j. Unspecified/mixed major physical injuries
2. Minor physical injury
   a. Minor cuts/bruises/welts
   b. Twisting/shaking
   c. Other minor injury
   d. Unspecified/mixed minor physical injuries
3. Physical injury, severity unspecified
   a. Unspecified/mixed physical injury
4. Sexual maltreatment
   a. Incest
   b. Exploitation
   c. Rape/intercourse
   d. Molestation
   e. Other sexual maltreatment
   f. Unspecified/mixed sexual maltreatment
5. Deprivation of necessities
   a. Neglecting to provide nourishment
   b. Neglecting to provide shelter
   c. Neglecting to provide clothing
   d. Neglecting to provide health care
   e. Failure to thrive
   f. Lack of supervision
   g. Educational neglect
   h. Unspecified/mixed deprivation of necessities
6. Emotional maltreatment
   a. Emotional abuse
   b. Emotional neglect
   c. Unspecified/mixed emotional maltreatment
7. Other maltreatment
   a. Abandonment
   b. Other
   c. Unspecified/mixed maltreatment
8. No maltreatment
9. Noninvolved child
10. Unknown

G. FATALITY

1. Fatal
2. Nonfatal
3. Unknown

APPENDIX B

CASE DATA PARTICIPANTS

REPORT TOTALS OF CASE DATA PARTICIPANTS
(N=457,747)

	TOTAL
Alaska	2,538*
Arizona	8,694
Arkansas	8,974
Colorado	6,805
Dist. of Columbia	2,529
Florida	79,701*
Georgia	11,048
Hawaii	1,841
Illinois	34,374
Indiana	14,511
Iowa	13,844
Kentucky	8,267
Louisiana	15,383
Maine	2,454
Michigan	31,425
Minnesota	9,764
Mississippi	3,021
Missouri	23,752
Nebraska	3,930
Nevada	4,397
New Hampshire	2,322
New Mexico	3,439
New York	55,245
North Carolina	11,539
North Dakota	1,759
Pennsylvania	9,420*
Rhode Island	705
South Carolina	7,022
Texas	52,182
Utah	6,406
Vermont	1,030
Virginia	12,168*
West Virginia	180
Wisconsin	7,011

*Represents individual child reports as opposed to family reports.

Guam	54
Virgin Islands	13
TOTAL	457,747